

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2017

**by D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 27<sup>th</sup> April 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/D/17/3167408**

**Russetts, The Alley, Stedham, Midhurst, GU29 0NR**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs M Perry against the decision of the South Downs National Park Authority.
  - The application Ref SDNP/16/05247/HOUS, dated 19 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2016.
  - The development proposed is a front dormer window.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached home of pleasing straight-forward design fronting the village green and forming part of an extremely attractive scene of established and traditional character featuring open land, landscape and varied ages and types of dwellings. The dwelling includes a one and half storey side extension which features a cat slide roof to the front and steps forward of the main elevation to accommodate a single garage at right angles. The proposal is as described above, with the dormer planned for the cat slide roof.
  4. The site lies within the Stedham Conservation Area. There is a duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Saved Policy BE6 of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review (1999) (LP) reflects this and adds more detail about assessment of proposals.
  5. The scheme proposed would be a major alteration to the cat slide roof's shape and form. This new addition would dominate this side of the building, bear no relationship to what lay below at ground level, and even look out of scale to the main house. It would appear ungainly and top heavy; there would be a lack of sympathy with the existing building design. There would be no sense of subordination to this part of the house and too much of the cat slide roof would be lost. The design has taken little in the way of cues from the property's front
-

elevation or its surroundings. There is a great variety of roof forms found locally but almost without exception dormers and other elements at upper level display subtlety. This whole composition would lack suitable subservience and would be jarring on the eye; it would detract from the aesthetics and character of the property itself and the wider area. This dormer, of gable end scale, would simply look too large relative the roof and it would appear most ungainly.

6. Saved Policies BE11 and BE12 of the LP are relevant. Taken together these policies seek, amongst other matters, to encourage development which is appropriate to the character of an area and suited in terms of design, detail and scale to its immediate and wider context. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with these policies. It would also run contrary to the aims of S72(1) of the Act and Saved Policy BE6 of the LP because there would not be preservation or enhancement of character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

*Other matters*

7. I sympathise with the wish to extend this property and appreciate that the Appellants feels that it has been a long and difficult road with the Council. I can see that thought has gone into a number of aspects of this proposal including the planned use of materials. I have viewed the nearby development examples drawn to my attention but found none to be directly comparable in terms of form, positioning or location and in any event I must determine this case on its own merits. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellants but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have been considered. Key objectives of the Framework are to protect and enhance the qualities of the built environment as well as to safeguard heritage assets; development plan policies which I cite mirror these. The Framework underlines that great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation. The appeal proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset however what public benefits there would be, such as construction employment, would not outweigh this harm. Furthermore there are no other benefits, including to the Appellants, which to my mind would be of a scale to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area which I have identified.

*Overall conclusion*

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

*D Cramond*

INSPECTOR